

CALIFORNIA MARINE LIFE PROTECTION ACT INITIATIVE

**Public Comments
in Support of Proposal 2 and 2-XA
March 18-20, 2008**

From: D&M Wilgis [<mailto:wilgis@dishmail.net>]
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 9:26 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA Comments

Hello,

Just let me give you the executive summary first "I support the 2-XA Proposal".

There are many reasons to support 2-XA;

Proposal 2-XA is supported by a LARGE amount of California Anglers that are represented by many fishing organizations. One is the Coast Side Fishing Club with their membership approaching roughly 14000 concerned anglers. Yes many will argue that the 14000 are not actively involved but arguably there are greater than 5000 that actively participate and take work off to attend as many activities the club puts on including showing up to public comment/protest events. Each of those 5000 anglers have circles of friends and co-workers that can be drawn upon to swell the influence of the 5000 to well over 50,000. Definitely enough votes to swing many of the tightly contested political races of late.

Proposal 2-XA shows that this process can be successful in meeting the MLPA act and maintaining and in fact improving a sustainable fishery.

Proposal 2-XA has the best possible arrangement that does not force the typical small boat angler to travel beyond their ability and therefore is less likely to contribute to the deaths of anglers. The other proposals just do not make sense and will likely end up directly causing unnecessary deaths. This is where I believe the whole process will unravel and the foundations that have funded the process will be vulnerable if the best available proposal (aka 2-XA) is not implemented. Why you ask, well almost all of the concerned anglers I know have expressed concerns that the "Process has already been decided" and as such is rigged to a specific non conservation, non-best available science based pre determined outcome. This rigging and not following the best available science is the crack in the door that will allow wrongful death suits against DFG, The Pew Trust, and the Packard Foundation and all involved that did not use the best available science and allowed a non science based "OPINION" to set the course of the MLPA. Take the high road and truly implement the ONLY PROPOSAL that meet the Letter and Spirit of the MLPA act "Proposal 2-XA"

In the first phase we experienced a "Pre-Determined" outcome and as many have seen we were outraged. To keep the peace the angling community is actively involved with the second phase of the MLPA process hoping to allow the MLPA team to see, use and implement the best available science. If we see that Proposal 2-XA is not implemented we will see that the MLPA teams did not come to the table to implement the "Best Available Science" but to implement a Pre-Determined Outcome. At this point I would guarantee that the MLPA will have to fight a repeal effort as well as exponentially increasing resistance with every new phase. Do the right things implement "Proposal 2-XA"

Please show us that the MLPA process can meet the requirements the voters implemented when we passed the law by implementing the only proposal "Proposal 2-XA) that meets the letter and spirit of the MLPA act.

Sincerely
Doug Wilgis
Bodega Bay, CA

From: Loretta Saunders [mailto:nannyscooter@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 9:06 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Proposal 2XA

To Whom It May Concern:
Re: Proposal 2XA

As a former homeowner in Gualala and a renter at the Sea Ranch and as a person with friends as homeowners on the Sear Ranch, I have just finished reading the letters on the MLPA on the North Coast blog page by CE Brown and others regarding public access. I agree completely with these folks. I have known people on the coast for approximately 20 years and understand completely what CE Brown and especially Archer Richardson are saying. Please give these folks the respect due them by hearing what is being said. I love the northern California coast and it should very simply always be pristine. Thank you.

Loretta Saunders

From: g.thomas01@juno.com [mailto:g.thomas01@juno.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 9:01 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Zone 2-xa support

To whom it may concern.

As a father and uncle my family and I spend many days on the ocean enjoying one anothers company while sharing a family tradition. Fishing is more than just coming home with a meal. It is quality family time that helps to build the foundation of moral character that will carry on into many other facets of the younger generation of my family. If we continue to CHIP AWAY at the TRADITIONS of the AMERICAN FAMILY we will have done nothing more than contibute to the EXTINCTION of AMERICA as we all know it.

It is for this reason that I fully support proposal 2-XA. Thank you for taking the time to read my letter.

Greg Thomas. Father of one, Uncle of 23

From: Richard Navarro [mailto:rnavarroelectric@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 8:29 PM
To: rich navarro; MLPAComments; Melissa Miller-Henson

To whom it may concern,

I belong to the SF Tyee club and the Coastside fishing club. I sit on the Board of Directors with the SF Tyee club which partners up with SF State and F&G to raise 50 thousand smolts each year since the 70s.

As a fisherman for over 30 years in the San Francisco area, I strongly recommend MLPA Proposal 2XA.

Proposal 2 is the only proposal that seems reasonable to a "Hook and line fisherman" like myself. Most of us Recreational fisherman only get to go fishing 3 to 5 times a month. Our Impact on the fishery's has little impact compared to the portrayals by others.

I hope that you understand that we have money invested and put major dollars to work in our fishing

realm with tackle, gas, boats, up keep maintenance, berth fees, fishing clubs,-all stimulate the economy.

It will be ashamed if you take away what we love by using incorrect science.

MY POINT ABOUT CORRECT SCIENCE IS THAT SOMEONE PUT TROLLED CAUGHT ROCK FISH WHILE TROLLING FOR SALMON IN LESS THAN 50 METERS INTO THE MPA'S. THIS IS NOT A PROBLEM AND A FISH & GAME OFFICER TESTIFIED TO THIS IN THIS PROCESS. HOWEVER, IT WAS IGNORED AND IMPLEMENTED IN THE MPA. ALSO IN THIS PROCESS YOU HAVE MAPPED AND CLOSED DOWN DEEP REEFS, WHICH VERY FEW PRIVATE BOATERS VENTURE TO BECAUSE OF DISTANCE AND FUEL. HOWEVER WHEN YOU DO THIS, IT CONCENTRATES THE PRIVATE BOATERS TO SMALLER AREAS WHICH CREATES A POSSIBLE PROBLEM TO THESE AREAS... MORE FISHERMAN THAN NORMAL WILL BE FISHING THESE AREAS BECAUSE OF YOUR NEW LAWS. MAKES NO SENSE!

THIS MLPA PROCESS IS FUNDED BY PRIVATE MONEY FROM TYPES LIKE PACKARD FOUNDATION WHO WANT US OFF THE WATER...I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHO'S GOING TO PAY FOR THE FUNDING TO REVISIT AND REVISE THE AREAS CLOSED DOWN. IT SEEMS TO ME IF WE GET SHUT DOWN WHY WOULD PACKARD TYPES REFUND THE PROCESS WHEN THEY WANT US FISHERMAN OFF THE WATER? WHY FUND SOMETHING THAT WOULD POSSIBLY OPEN FISHING GROUNDS BACK UP AND GO AGAINST THEIR AGENDA(PACKARD TYPES).

I would just like to add that my family and friend have looked forward to BBQs throughout the years from fish we caught out on the ocean and they are devastated with the possibility of no ocean fishing. I have a 4 year old boy and a 8 year old girl who love to be on Daddy's boat fishing and it looks like this is being taken away chunk by chunk.

I was looking forward to the process working for a better fishery, however from decisions made (such as the 50 meter rule in a MPA while trolling for Salmon)has made me and fellow fisherman irate and not trusting of the process. You have set the system up for more failure with the concentrated fishing areas YOU AND THE FEDS HAVE ESTABLISHED. If you do the math it's simple.. spread things out.

Understand what fisherman do, and on top of that understand that a recreational fisherman with a hook and line is not even an issue.

So, I implore you to push MLPA Proposal 2XA across.

Thank you, Rich Navarro

From: Phishbelly@aol.com [mailto:Phishbelly@aol.com]

Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 5:43 PM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: MLPA comment

To whom it may concern,
Please support option 2AX, and keep the ocean safe for the small boat fishermen.

Mike Johnson

From: spsurfs@aol.com [mailto:spsurfs@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 5:33 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject:

Hello, my name is Sean Elerick, and I own a sport fishing boat slipped in Santa Cruz. I have been a fisherman all my life, and the ocean is my church. I help feed my family with salmon, rockcod, halibut and crab throughout the year. I feel proposal 2xa is the most balanced between conservation and public access to fishing around our ports. It is the only proposal that lets me safely get out and fish near port in Bodega. Safety is a big concern for myself and many others on the ocean. I also hope that instead of having plans on how to ban fishing in the future the MLPA puts plans in action to help the fishery. I wish that the environment could help itself but lets face it, mankind has made it hard for the environment to co-exist with itself and I think we need! to help it by installing better hatchery programs and more of them.
Thank you sean

From: Chambers, Timothy A [mailto:timothy.a.chambers@smithbarney.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 5:00 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support for Proposal 2XA

To the members for the BRTF and the Fish and Game Commission:

I strongly urge you to support Proposal 2-XA. I have been fishing the ocean outside of Bodega Bay for 25 years. I am 35 years old now. My grandfather began taking me when I was a child and today, though he is gone, I take my 84 year old grandmother to fish these same waters. She caught a 40lb salmon last year herself. Now, with the implementation of the MLPA we are facing the potential of not being able to fish many of these treasured waters ever again. I am a father of three and I think of being able to take my grandchildren to experience what I did as a youngster. Please consider the impacts of the decisions you face to those of us who love and care for our oceans. I am an active conservationist, and love our natural resources. I desire to teach this to my offspring as well. Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal that offers hope for that end.

Beyond my own concerns I have concerns for others. I support Proposal 2-AX because it allows for areas to be reached by those with small boats. It leaves enough area so small areas do not get over fished. In a nutshell, Proposal 2-XA is a well conceived, logical plan, based on sound science that will also be easy to enforce.

Thank you for your consideration.

Tim Chambers

From: Ken Frost [mailto:rdcsdal@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 4:46 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: 2AX

People are important to! Leave me some recreation! Choose 2AX so that I can continue to fish.

From: Pete359exhd@wmconnect.com [mailto:Pete359exhd@wmconnect.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 3:59 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: option 2ax

I FORMERLY REQUEST THAT MLPA USE AND ADOPT OPTION 2AX.

From: Matthew Plut [mailto:sw44magnum@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 3:56 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Please Support Proposal 2 for the NCC MPA

I am a recreational fisherman and a member of Coastside Fishing Club.

I am writing to urge the members of the BRTF and the Fish and Game Commission to support **Proposal 2-XA** because it not only satisfies, but exceeds the criteria defined for marine reserves by achieving a "High" level of protection while also satisfying the size and spacing requirements. I can honestly say I do not like this proposal, yet it is the only one of the three which I would consider acceptable. **Proposal 2-XA** has accomplished these goals while impacting about 18% of the coast line. This is on par with that of the Central Coast MPA's.

Having watched the last two meetings via webcast, it is clear to me **Proposal 1/3** incomplete. Nonetheless it encompasses about 22% of the coastline and is much more restrictive the public as a whole.

The most restrictive, **Proposal 4**, manages to encompass about 27% of the coastline. This would effectively make the North Central Coast region a look, but do not touch, aquarium.

Please remember the words of Commissioner Kellogg at the March 2, 2007 Fish and Game Commission meeting:

"... And before we get too carried away, we need to give them (MPA'S) an opportunity to work. And I believe that in this next phase we should pick an area, and this would be a good one, to make it as open to all the fishermen, the commercial, the recreational, the sport fishing, the kelp, abalone and everybody else as much as we possibly can so we have something to compare with the rest of the MPA's we've already set up. And see if it makes a difference by allowing more fishing in some of the areas than others."

I do not like **Proposal 2**, yet I strongly urge you to support **Proposal 2**. Support of any other proposal will essentially put our ocean off limits to the public and relegate it as something to be viewed only on a video screen.

Respectfully, Matthew S. Plut

From: Dale Norbeck [mailto:kodiox@pacbell.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 3:50 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA 2AX

please choose 2AX and avoid the useless and countless damage done to people and businesses all up and down the coast. recreational fishing is a minor problem compared to the massive damages being done to the delta and related fisheries by the diversion of water to southern calif.

Dale Norbeck

From: Rick Betz [mailto:ric1ric@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 3:06 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject:

Please adopt option 2AX and help save the commercial fisherman who run small vessels and their families, as well as , save us recreational fisherman s ability to fish in the ocean in a safe a manner. Any other choice bankrupts families and kills fishermen and fisherwomen because you will be forcing them to risk life and limb in order to participate in their greatest passion. Thank you for your time.

Rick Betz

From: john bloom [mailto:johnbloom@charter.net]

Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 2:59 PM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: option

Option 2AX is the only viable option that makes any sense.

From: Shawn Millar [mailto:cafisherman2003@yahoo.com]

Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 2:58 PM

To: MLPAComments

Subject:

Please adopt option 2AX and help save the commercial fisherman who run small vessels and their families, as well as , save us recreational fisherman's ability to fish in the ocean in a safe a manner. Any other choice bankrupts families and kills fishermen and fisherwomen because you will be forcing them to risk life and limb in order to participate in their greatest passion. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely

Shawn Millar

From: redpitbull5150@aol.com [mailto:redpitbull5150@aol.com]

Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 2:55 PM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: option 2ax

Please choose option 2ax for the sake of preserving our sportfishing opportunities, and for the sakle of the economy as a whole.

Thank you.

www.fullspeedfishing.com

From: Bob Watrous [mailto:bob@rcconcrete.net]

Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 2:50 PM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: MLPA's please choose 2AX

Please adopt option 2AX and help save the commercial fisherman who run small vessels and their families, as well as , save us recreational fisherman's ability to fish in the ocean in a safe a manner. Any other choice bankrupts families and kills fishermen and fisherwomen because you will be forcing them to risk life and limb in order to participate in their greatest passion. Thank you for your time.

Bob Watrous, MBA

Estimator

RC Concrete, Inc.

From: William Weissberg [mailto:bill911s@yahoo.com]

Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 2:28 PM

To: MLPAComments

Cc: John Dunn
Subject: Requested Action

Dear Panel Member,

As an active sport fisherman I urge you to vote yes on option 2AX. Thank you for your help.

Bill Weissberg

From: jeff isaacson [mailto:jeff.isaacson@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 2:19 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Please Support 2-XA

Dear BRTF,
Please allow me and mine to safely fish the ocean from our home ports, HMB & Golden Gate. The proposed Plan 2-XA is the only choice for conservation as well as safety. My two Daughters and Son all enjoy fishing with Dad and that is one of the few things we all do together, PLEASE don't take that away from us. Prop.1-3 is a disaster for the small boater, it puts a bigger fuel bill on the table as well as endangering my family. I recommend, no beg you to please put forward 2-XA as the best choice.

Recreational Fisher person
Jeff Isaacson
Hayward, Ca.

From: Tyrus Gerlach [mailto:tyrusg@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 1:40 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA

Marine Life Protection Act is about to finalize the areas where recreational sport fishing is to happen. I urge that the MLPA panel panel adopt option 2AX.

thank you.

Tyrus M. Gerlach
1500 Eastman Lane
Petaluma, CA 94952

From: C Paterson [mailto:cpkayak@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 11:57 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: 2xa

hello, my name is Chris Paterson and i support proposal 2XA. My primary recreational pursuit is fishing. I own a boat and several kayaks, much of my discretionary spending is done in pursuit of my pasion for angling. I believe that proposal 2XA is the best compromise between many divergent intersests.

sincerly, Chris Paterson

From: Joe Russell [mailto:joemrussell@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 10:57 AM

To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support for Proposal 2AX

Recently I had sent a letter in support of MLPA Proposal 2; however, since then I have learned that the policy I am supporting is actually Proposal 2AX. As I stated in my first correspondence, I am a recreational fisherman in Northern California, and am very much concerned about the sustainability of our marine fisheries. Their success depends heavily on proper management as well as continuing scientific studies to explore and determine the health and viability of the involved fish species. It is only by carefully considering this data that we are capable of making informed decisions. I find it utterly appalling to read that the SAT, BRTF, and other involved task forces and committees have been relying on antiquated population data and anecdotal evidence of by-catch numbers, despite ongoing efforts to provide more current numbers. Though I am in support of rotating (finite) moratoriums on various fish species, with financial relief for those individuals/businesses affected, I do not subscribe to the nuclear option of completely and indefinitely shutting down California's coastline. That said, I express my utmost support for the MLPA Proposal 2AX, wherein a far-more agreeable management and enforceable solution is offered that will both promote further intensive study as well as keeping California's coastline available to the individuals who love to share in its beauty and resources.

Respectfully,
Joe Russell

From: sean@wagstaff.info [<mailto:sean@wagstaff.info>]
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 10:23 AM
Cc: Melissa Miller-Henson
Subject: Re: Support of proposal 2

Please note that I sent the letter, below, yesterday, but I should have said that I support Proposal 2XA, which has replaced Proposal 2.
Thank you again,
Dorit Fehrensens

dorit@wagstaff.info wrote:

> Dorit Fehrensens
> Palo Alto, California
>
> Dear MLPA committee, please adopt proposal 2.
>
> I appreciate and understand your efforts to protect marine life, and
> agree that marine reserves are necessary. However, I also think it's
> important that people be allowed to keep a way of life that
> incorporates living with the sea. I would like my children to at least
> occasionally interact with nature the way their grandparents did, and
> that means fishing, sometimes, as well as admiring tide pool creatures
> at arm's length. Protecting species and habitats is important, but
> it's unreasonable to suddenly designate vast tracts of traditional
> fishing grounds, particularly ones close to scarce north-coast harbors
> and protected waters, as a patchwork of protected "wilderness,"
> without considering the impact of those decisions on people.
>
> It is vital that children learn that not all food comes from Safeway,
> or even from antibiotic-and-sea-lice-laden aquaculture pens. Catching
> -- and killing -- their own provides an important lesson in life and
> nature and you should protect their right to learn that.
>
> Besides, won't forcing fishermen off the white squares on the
> checkerboard simply push them to fish the red squares twice as hard?
> You "wilderness" designations should go to large, meaningful tracts

thinking about and ultimately caring about what lives under the waves? (Take for example, that fact that many sport fishermen fish voluntarily on a primarily catch-and-release basis.) Deprive us of opportunities for good quality local fishing experiences -- and to teach our children about life on the sea -- and you will silence not only leading advocates of marine life protection, but generations of advocates to come.

Sean Wagstaff
Palo Alto, Calif.

From: zennerbiz@aol.com [mailto:zennerbiz@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 9:45 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA Draft Proposal 2

Hi all,

I support Draft Proposal 2.

For most of my 53 years of life I have fished, free dived, scuba dived, surfed, sailed, and spent time at Northern California water and beaches. This coastline and it's resources are integrally woven into my being.

I am married with 2 children, and have an extended family of 28. We all share the same love for, and repeated use of this wonderful Coastline and it's resources.

If through the MLPA process you allow large portions of our local waters to no longer be available for fishing or harvesting any aquatic life, you will forever change the lifestyle of our family and many other CA residents who have not realized that they should be sending you this feedback. (and who, in my opinion form a silent majority).

Please support the implementation of Draft Proposal 2.

Kind regards, Jim

Jim & Pauline Zenner
Karon Properties

From: Lisa Zenner [mailto:lrzenner@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 7:10 AM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: John Zenner
Subject: Support Draft Proposal 2

To California Department of Fish and Game:

Please support "Draft Proposal 2" of the North Coast MLPA process.

As a recreational diver and parent I care deeply about our ocean and coast. I want to teach my children about the sealife that we live so close to - and the marine science inherent in it. Diving and fishing along the North Coast provide experiential learning not equalled by watching from a distance - or reading from a book. We have always treated the ocean with respect and awe while playing in and enjoying its many gifts. As a result I feel compelled to write to you today.

I ask you to support "Draft Proposal 2" of the MLPA process. This proposal exceeds ALL of the criteria for the MLPA requirements and still allows good public access. Since the MLPA process will permanently change our usage of the north coast I strongly feel draft proposal 2 better addresses conservation and public needs with reasonable and long term benefits for all.

Thank you for your consideration,
Lisa Zenner

From: Tad Houston [<mailto:tadhouston@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 12:05 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Proposal 2 please

Hello, my name is Tad Houston, and i own a sport fishing boat slipped in bodega. I have been a fisherman all my life, and the ocean is my church. I help feed my family with salmon, rockcod, halibut and crab throughout the year. I feel proposal 2xa is the most balanced between conservation and public access to fishing around our ports. It is the only propasal that lets me safely get out and fish near port in Bodega. Safety is a big concern for me on the ocean, please help me stay safe, and continue to enjoy the fresh seafood i have been providing my family for many years to come.

Thank you, Tad Houston

From: sdaunell@svn.net [<mailto:sdaunell@svn.net>]
Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2008 7:22 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: support of option 2-XA

BRTF

This is the second E mail that I have sent. the first supported option #2 that doesn't exist any more.

I am a small craft sport fisherman from Point Reyes, Ca. that fishes out of Bodega and Tomoles bays three to four times a month when weather will permit. I have fished this area for many years and enjoy the many days on the water with my kids and am now looking forward to being out with grandkids. I feel that option 2-XA is the only option that will give small boat fisherman like me a chance for safe close to port fishing oportunities. I strongly support option 2-XA and hope that it will also get your support.

Thank You,
Larry Daunell

From: sdaunell@svn.net [<mailto:sdaunell@svn.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 7:53 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: support of option 2

dear sirs,

I have been a long time sport fisherman that enjoys ocean fishing. We fish out of Tomoles and Bodega bays about three to four times a month. we usually spend about \$100.00 per trip on food, bait, gas, boat supplies, camp grounds. It is a lot of money but we don't mind spending at local shops to be able to do what we enjoy. we only keep enough to have a fresh fish dnner, when we are lucky enough to catch something, we are not trying to fill our freezers. I feel that option #2 is the only option that gives a small boat sport fisherman like myself any realistic options to get out and fish.

Thank You
Larry Daunell

From: herbert rodricks [<mailto:hrodricks@comcast.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 4:53 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: No Central Coast MPA

For all the reasons you have already heard regarding support for Proposal #2, I'd like to add my support. I encourage you to accept Proposal #2 and forward it to the F&G for implementation.

Thank you,
Herbert Rodricks

From: Petereit, Eric H [mailto:eric.petereit@retechsystemsllc.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 4:43 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: I wish to reiterate my support of proposal 2 for the north coast MLPA process

I am deeply concerned that the options being considered are so unnecessarily overly restrictive that they will in the long run do more harm than good. Like it or not, fishermen have always been the stewards of the sea. They deeply care about the health of the eco-system. But once the fishermen are driven from the ocean, who will care? I look at my kids and wonder if they will care. Our love of the ocean comes from being part of the eco-system that we wish to protect. Remove us from that eco-system and we will die or move away. For sure, our children will not have the passion for that resource as we do now. This invites a much greater abuse than proposal 2 might add over the other MLPA proposals.

I strongly urge you to accept proposal 2 for the north coast MLPA.

Respectfully, Eric Petereit; Connie Petereit; Bryan Petereit; Ethan Petereit

From: Michael R. Ebert [mailto:mike@machineryandequipment.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 4:16 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Proposal two please

I am a recreational fisherman who supports plan 2 the Coastsides Conservation Plan for the MPLA. I feel that the Plan 2xa will provide the only way I can take my nieces and nephews, great nieces and nephews fishing this year and in the future. I While I don't have children, these kids fish with me frequently. They are from 1 to 50 years old and. I am 66 years old and my fishing partner is 85; all of them love to fish in the ocean, bay and in the delta... The alternatives to plan 2 force us to fish farther from the traditional areas we have fished for years. Please be realistic in your proposals, but I really think the one that is most well thought out is that of Coast Side.

I believe that if plan 1-3 or 4 are implemented we (my family) will be unable to fish in the ocean. The "other" plans have pushed out the fishing grounds too far ranging for my family. I keep one boat at South Beach Harbor and a smaller boat in the Delta, For Ocean fishing, the proposed no take zone is stacked in the same fashion as Pillar Point...the no take RED zone is closest to the harbor with the blue hatched (take zone) positioned much farther north. We are talking about kids AND OLD GUYS that love the ocean...why are we even considering making it more dangerous for them to enjoy the waters you are "trying to save for them"?

The oceans belong to all of us and last time I looked there is a special section in the California constitution dealing with our rights to fish. As a member of the Coastsides Fishing Club I observe and ask everyone to abide by sane conservation of our important fishing resource.

Please do the RIGHT THING and support the Plan 2xa as presented; that's the CORRECT decision.

Michael R. Ebert
President
Machinery & Equipment Co.

From: Zenner, Paul J [mailto:Paul.Zenner@xerox.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 3:20 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: We support Draft Proposal 2

We grew up in California and I have spent the last 40 years on her oceans and rivers from Eureka to San Diego. We fish, dive, and sail and we are a good stewards of the ocean. I have taught my two teenage sons this. More importantly most people I have met who use this recreational habitat are also great stewards and those that aren't

were quickly corrected by us. There for we are supporting Draft Proposal 2 which exceeds all your goals and still allows access for my children to use the areas we grew up taking care of. Please listen to us as we also all vote.

Paul Zenner, Elissa Zenner, Andrew Zenner, and Nick Zenner

From: Allen E [mailto:hemiallen@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 11:23 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA suggestion

Good morning

I am one of the thousands of members of Coastside fishing club, and just recently aquired a boat capable of fishing our great coastline for all legal fish species and crabs. I have invested many thousands of dollars in the boat, related crab cages, fishing equipment and soft tackle, and I along with my close family of 9 licensed fishermen have enjoyed camping at the coast and partaking in the sport.

I ask that you consider plan 2 as the best choice for reasonable changes to the fishery, while still allowing sport fishermen to continue enjoying the sport, and also continuing to spend millions of dollars in taxes and license fee's hopefully used in best science to manage the fishery for generations to come.

Thank you very much

Allen Elsholz
Lodi, California

From: Peter Yeatrakas [mailto:pyeatrakas@wespay.org]
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 8:11 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Please adopt CoastSide Prposal Plan 2

To the individuals and groups considering profound changes for current and future fishermen and women:

I am a recreational fisherman who supports plan 2 the Coastside Conservation Plan for the MPLA. I feel that the Plan 2xa will provide the only way I can take my nieces and nephews, great nieces and nephews fishing this year and in the future. I While I don't have children, these kids fish with me frequently. They are from 1 to 50 years old and. I am 66 years old and my fishing partner is 85; all of them love to fish in the ocean, bay and in the delta. The alternatives to plan 2 force us to fish farther from the traditional areas we have fished for 50 (Ray has been fishing for 70 years; used to row in the bay competitively in highschool) years. My father is turning over in his grave from observing some of the "dumb" proposals. Please be realistic in your proposals, but I really think the one that is most well thought out is that of Coastside.

I believe that if plan 1-3 or 4 are implemented we (my family) will be unable to fish in the ocean. The "other" plans have pushed out the fishing grounds too far ranging for my family. I keep one boat at South Beach Harbor and a smaller boat in the Delta, For Ocean fishing, the proposed no take zone is stacked in the same fashion as Pillar Point...the no take RED zone is closest to the harbor with the blue hatched (take zone) positioned much farther north. We are talking about kids AND OLD GUYS that love the ocean...why are we even considering making it more dangerous for them to enjoy the waters you are "trying to save for them"?

The oceans belong to all of us and last time I looked there is a special section in the California constitution dealing with our rights to fish. As a member of the Coastside Fishing Club I observe and ask everyone to abide by sane conservation of our important fishing resource.

Please do the RIGHT THING and support the Plan 2xa as presented; that's the CORRECT decision.

Thank you,
Pete Yeatrakas, San Mateo CA 94404

From: Tosh [mailto:Tosh@astound.net]
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 10:51 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA Initiative/North Central Coast Project

To whom It May Concern,

I am a recreational fisherman who whole heartedly supports the adoption of Proposal 2-XA. As a long time fisherman and boater in the Bay Area, I've supported the sportfishing industry since the early 70's. To adopt any other proposal other than 2-XA would be economically devastating to that industry, including our local bait and tackle shops, charter boat operations, marinas, fuel docks, and the DFG in lost license revenues.

Over the years, we have seen drastic reductions in the time we can spend on the water, take limits, and an increasing cost to operate our boats. I do agree that the shortening of the seasons and reduction of fish limits are necessary steps to the conservation of our resources, but a near shore closure outside the Gate would just increase the traffic and pressures to those species which populate San Francisco Bay itself. What happens when the striped bass, halibut, and shark population inside the Bay become devastated, do you close it to fishing also?

I have always contended that fishing is one of the best hobbies for our children. It keeps them off the streets and gives them something to look forward to. It is not the catching of fish, although that is a plus, but the anticipation of catching a fish and the road getting there which makes it worth while.

I sincerely hope you will consider recommending Proposal 2-XA.

Sincerely,
Bob Nakaji
Concord, CA

From: A.Billet [mailto:abillet@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 10:32 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject:

California department of Fish and Game,

As a recreational diver and fisherman I care deeply about our ocean and coast. I come from a family that considers the ocean a blessed and sacred place. We have always treated the ocean with respect and awe while playing in and enjoying its many gifts. As a result I feel compelled to write to you today.

I ask you to support "Draft Proposal 2" of the MLPA process. This proposal exceeds ALL of the criteria for the MLPA requirements and still allows good public access. Since the MLPA process will permanently change our usage of the north coast I strongly feel draft proposal 2 better addresses conservation and public needs with reasonable and long term benefits for all.

Thank you for your consideration,
Audrey Billet

From: Walter Lim [mailto:airtiger327@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 9:41 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA Initiative

Dear Stakeholders,

I am a recreational fisherman who supports plan 2 the Coastside Conservation Plan for the MPLA. I feel that it provides the only way I can fish near shore. If plan 1, 3 or 4 are implemented I and others will not be able to ocean fish.

The oceans belong to all of us and we need to conserve the resource and respect wildlife. We as sportfishermen are determined to maintain a sustainable fishery. If we overfish, then it only hurts ourselves. Please support the Plan 2xa as presented as I feel it is the only viable option that allows us to fish the ocean.

Thank you,

From: Lee Dickson [mailto:ldickson@3gcgroup.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 9:29 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: PROPOSAL 2!!!!

In case you guy's didn't pay attention to my first email, I want to make it clear that I support option 2. If you cut off my access and make it only available to one group of users (divers), my wife and I will take the \$15,000.00 in state taxes we pay, as well as the \$80-100,000.00 we spend in California every year, to NEVADA!!!

Lee Dickson

From: Paul Venker [mailto:Paul@greengoinc.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 9:00 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Plan 2

Hello Stakeholders and BRTF,

I am a recreational fisherman who supports plan 2 the Coastside Conservation Plan for the MPLA. I feel that the Plan 2xa will provide the only way. If plan 1-3 or 4 are implemented we (my family) will be unable to ocean fish. The "other" plans have pushed out the fishing grounds to far for my young fishermen. For instance the launch at Pillar Point the proposed Red zone(no take) is right adjacent to the harbor while the Blue "Take Zone" is stacked further north making a simple trip out for dabs or halibut a dangerous proposition for the small private boater. The only other alternative that could work for us is out the gate to fish Duxberry Buoy...but the proposed no take zone is stacked in the same fashion as Pillar Point...the no take RED zone is closest to the harbor with the blue hatched (take zone) positioned much farther north. We are talking about kids that love the ocean...why are we even considering making it more dangerous for them to enjoy the waters you are "trying to save for them"? The oceans belong to all of us and as a member of the Coastside Fishing Club I teach each child that fishes with me about the need to conserve the resource and respect the wildlife. My youngest asked me if she will ever be able to catch a big halibut like her

Sister and I could not answer. Please support the Plan 2xa as presented as I feel it is the only viable option that allows me to share the ocean with my girls. By the way 3 years ago I bought into the Lifetime Fishing License Program of the two oldest girls...one will need her license next year and the youngest may never need hers at all..... I was scheduled to buy 4 more as they grow but I just can't justify the cost verses the proposed fishery. That would be plan 2. Thank you,

Paul J. Venker
Concord, Ca.

From: Guiliano, Andrew, LPRD [mailto:andrew.guiliano@wachovia.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 9:00 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA

I support Proposal #2. Limiting access to public land and water is against the principles that this country was founded on over 200 years ago.

[Andy Guiliano](#)

From: mike oleary [mailto:mmbole2003@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 8:42 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA Initiative

My name is Mike O'Leary . I am a member of The Coastside Fishing Club and a recreational fisherman. I would like to express my concerns about the MLPA processes. I believe that we need to focus entirely the scientific evidence provided and not let the fog (money) of special interest dictate the proposed MPA's.

I think there will be a large economic impact that will cause a domino effect and bankrupt many small business's.

I would very much enjoy the opportunity to be allowed to take my grand kids fishing in the future. I am in support of the MLPA proposal 2.

Thanks Mike O'Leary

From: Shawn Malakiman [mailto:shawn@calprinting.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 8:33 AM
To: Melissa Miller-Henson
Subject: Salmon fishing

[I am in favor of the proposal 2, it is the most logical option.](#)

Thank You
Shawn Malakiman
President, EZturner

From: Tony Koregelos [mailto:ihookem@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 8:28 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA Proposal #2 Support

To whom it may concern,
I have been fishing norether California for over 35 years or as long as I can remember. And as i sit here trying to

think of what words to describe the situation I am put in, I am almost paralyzed by the fact that most of our fishery will be closed this coming year. Is this just a bad dream or a completely poor job by our governing bodies. Well I have to say both. I would hope that the decision maker will strongly look at MLPA Proposal #2, for it is only viable option to giving the recreational fisherman a chance to carry on our way of life. I would also recommend that better decisions be made in the future on our resource. Shutting down the Ocean is not an option for the mismanagement of our fisheries.

Sincerely
Anthony James Koregelos

From: Starr, Michael [mailto:MPSc@pge.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 6:49 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MPLA

Hello Stakeholders and BRTF,

I am a recreational fisherman who supports plan 2 the Coastside Conservation Plan for the MPLA. I feel that the Plan 2xa will provide the only way I can take my 6 young nieces fishing near shore. The girls range in age from 3 to 16. If plan 1-3 or 4 are implemented we (my family) will be unable to ocean fish. The "other" plans have pushed out the fishing grounds to far for my young fisherwomen. For instance the launch at Pillar Point the proposed Red zone(no take) is right adjacent to the harbor while the Blue "Take Zone" is stacked further north making a simple trip out for dabs or halibut a dangerous proposition for the small private boater. The only other alternative that could work for us is out the gate to fish Duxberry Buoy...but the proposed no take zone is stacked in the same fashion as Pillar Point...the no take RED zone is closest to the harbor with the blue hatched (take zone) positioned much farther north. We are talking about kids that love the ocean...why are we even considering making it more dangerous for them to enjoy the waters you are "trying to save for them"? The oceans belong to all of us and as a member of the Coastside Fishing Club I teach each child that fishes with me about the need to conserve the resource and respect the wildlife. My youngest asked me if she will ever be able to catch a big halibut like her Sister and I could not answer. Please support the Plan 2xa as presented as I feel it is the only viable option that allows me to share the ocean with my girls. By the way 3 years ago I bought into the Lifetime Fishing License Program of the two oldest girls...one will need her license next year and the youngest may never need hers at all..... I was scheduled to buy 4 more as they grow but I just justify the cost verses the proposed fishery. Laura,Regan,Tera,Kayla,Alayna and Monica are counting on you to make the CORRECT decision. That would be plan 2.

Thank you,

Michael Starr
Livermore, California

From: Terry_Lewis@cargill.com [mailto:Terry_Lewis@cargill.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 6:38 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA Comment

To whom it may concern,

I have been watching the MLPA "process" unfold from the sidelines.I am a lifelong fisherman in California and have traveled to other states and countries to pursue my sport.I have a large amount of money tied up in a 20 foot boat.Over 4000 dollars in electronics and over 40,000.00 dollars in a big truck to pull it with.Not to mention many ,many thousands spent on fishing tackle.

You ask,where was that money spent? In CALIFORNIA !!! As I watch our traditional fishing areas disappear one by one I have to ask myself why.Why me,the guy on the bottom of the totem pole is paying for Californias mismanagement of water and our resources? A few wealthy people(RLF) with nothing better to do with their money than to mess with my passion are driving this .It is not a problem to them because they can fly off and fish(if they have ever tried it) in some exotic local.I as a local ,regular Joe, cannot afford to do that.I have spent many thousands of dollars on my sport for nothing if you continue to shut down all of our fishing areas.I am asking you to support MLPA proposal 2 only because it is the lesser of many

evils. Our people have tried very hard to come up with a compromise and this seems to be the best of the lot.

Please consider all the livleyhoods that are being affected by your actions regarding the MLPA's. All the family days on the water. And a sport my grandchildren are learning to love as I have .

Sincerely,

Terry Lewis

IGFA world record holder

and regular Joe

From: Dean Taylor [<mailto:deanoso@earthlink.net>]

Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 4:11 AM

To: MLPAComments

Subject:

Dear Sirs,

I am a San Francisco native, have read about the upcoming decisions, and support #2!

Dean Taylor

From: Jim & Betty Mae Locke [<mailto:jnblocke@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Tuesday, March 18, 2008 11:06 PM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: MLPA Proposals (#2)

Hello,

My start in recreational fishing in the ocean was when I was 9 years old, in 1946, on a flat bottom rental skiff out of "Princeton By the Sea", now called Pillar Point Harbor. I went fishing in the ocean that first time with my father and my other lifelong fishing buddy cousin. We had our own 5 hp outboard motor and planned to go Salmon Trolling. They set me up in the bow of this 16' plywood rental skiff and told me to hang onto this big fishing rod that I thought was pulling so hard trolling that I would not be able to know when I had a fish biting on my line. My fishing mentors told me "not to worry", that I would know when the salmon bit on my offering. Sure enough, when the fishing rod just went crazy jerking around, I realized this must be what my mentors were talking about. I caught my first salmon that day and things have evolved to a life long passion to fish the coast of California. I fished my lifetime with my father who passed on a few years ago to those mystical fishing grounds beyond our earthly constraints. I still do fish the coast with the cousin who helped start it all for me back in 1946.

The coastal fishing that I have enjoyed so very much has been my most reverend activity and I spend considerable economic funds to support that recreational activity. Boat ownership, licensing for boat, trailer, tow vehicle, insurance, fuel, moorage, food, launches, tackle, and lodgings are but a few of the economic contributions that I have made to the recreational fishing environments over the many decades since my initiation in 1946. Since that initial experience I have coastal fished from San Diego to Crescent City, plus many places along the Oregon and Washington coastal areas. My wife and I are CA Lifetime Fishing License holders and three years ago I purchased a gift Lifetime Fishing License for our grandson, who is now 6 years old. I surely hope that I will be able to mentor my grandson and teach him all about the joys, adventures, and respect for conservation needs of CA coastal fishing.

I want to strongly urge you to accept **Proposal 2** for the MLPA North Central Coast Region as it seems to be the most well thought out proposal taking into consideration many different advocacies. Strong conservation positions along with some realistic economic and social considerations do come together in **Proposal 2**.

Thank you for all the effort being put into this Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) implementation as it is a huge task. And, above all, thanks for listening.

Jim Locke

From: Dave Witte, personal [mailto:wittefam@pacbell.net]
Sent: Tuesday, March 18, 2008 10:41 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Re: MLPA process

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing to express my feelings about the current fishing situation and the MLPA process.

I can still remember fishing with my Father as a youth. We spent many weekends camping, launching and fishing out of Vierra's Resort in the Delta. I still vividly remember catching striped bass with my Father, may he rest in peace. We also took many trips on party boats out of Berkeley, where he would buy the entire load and bring the entire company along.

I have carried on his tradition by teaching my son to fish. Although he is only twelve and is completely blind, he has caught wild salmon, won third place in a kid's fishing derby, helped out during crabbing and caught stripers and catfish in the Delta. He would far rather spend time fishing with his parents instead of getting in trouble with his contemporaries. We currently spend a great deal of our disposable income on boating and fishing between two boats in the Delta and a saltwater fishing boat, I'd estimate that we spend well over \$15,000 a year for bait, fuel, maintenance and accessories.

For these reasons and preservation of the family unit, I strongly urge support of MLPA proposal 2 since it provides the only real solution for solution to managing the fish on a scientific basis while maintaining a fishery for our children and grandchildren. It is clear that there are other political and financial forces at work during this process. I hope that someone will take the time to review and think about the scientific data that has been presented instead of being influenced by the "Big Money" which is being spent.

Sincerely,
Dave Witte

From: Jim Mc [mailto:jimbob28@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, March 18, 2008 10:27 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: My Comments on the MLPA

Dear Folks,

I have been sport fishing in the Ocean here in the Bay Area for the past 30 years. I feel that it aided in the character development of my son who grew up fishing with me and it has been a very rewarding activity.

I fully support conservation and the environment. What I do not support are the groups and proposals that make public domain off limits to the public in the mistaken belief that that's the only to conserve the natural resources. There are definitely fishing practices that can be practiced within these proposed MLPA's that will not harm the intended revitalization of the endangered species.

With this in mind, I support **MLPA Proposal 2** that is being put forward by the Coastside Fishing Club.

Please keep this in mind and don't make many of the best spots in our local Ocean off limits to the thousands of people that get great pleasure in fishing out there.

J. R. McCombs

From: MICHAEL PEARL [mailto:mcpearl2@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, March 18, 2008 8:07 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support MLPA proposal 2

As a concerned citizen of California and lifelong fisherman I urge you to accept proposal 2 when deciding the MLPA proposals. This is the only fair proposal for all people concerned.

As fishermen we have the most at stake in the future of fishing and are the strongest advocates when it comes to conserving our natural resources. We would accept nothing less than to see that our children and future generations are allowed to partake in this precious pastime. I spend at least \$10,000 per year on fishing related activities in California and if I do not have the Rights as a citizen of this state to enjoy its oceanic resources this amount and much more will be spent in Canada, Alaska and Mexico. Once again I urge you to accept MLPA proposal 2. Thank You, Michael Pearl M.D.

From: Mike Velasquez [mailto:velasquez.mcids@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Tuesday, March 18, 2008 7:56 PM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: MLPA Proposal

My name is Mike Velasquez. I have been a Bay Area resident for the past 51 years and have been actively involved in the outdoors for much of that time. As a business man, Father of 2 children with a wife of 30 years as well as a licensed Captain. I have written today in support of Proposal 2. I feel this is the best proposal that is presented to the Council, it addresses all the requirements set forth and is a balance between 1-3 as well as 4.

Thank-you for your time in this matter.

Mike Velasquez

From: Jim Volberding [mailto:jamiv925@hotmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, March 18, 2008 7:02 PM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: Reasons I support Proposal 2

Hello,

Proposal 2 includes socio economic facts and provides access for small boats to fishing areas. I usually spend my money on fishing equipment/tackle. I also use the Emeryville Sport fishing center to book reservations on open load party boats. An extreme closure within the Pt. Reyes, Farrallon Island and fitzgerald sub regions will result in Economic losses for many different areas of businesses. These include Bait, Tackle, fuel, Restaurants, Hotels/Motels and the Charter boat fleets in Bodega, San Francisco Bay and at Half Moon Bay. The Shortened Rockfish season and the impending Salmon Closure is already showing repercussions in economic losses and just trying to stay in business for many of the charter boat operators.

My Grandson is 13 years old and has been to the Farrallon islands. He is hooked on fishing and I Prefer that over him being out on the streets or involved in unknown situations. Those of the BRTF that haven't traveled to the islands on a small boat or even a charter boat should do so. I'm sure that any Captain could give a very informational tour of the Island chain.

Please insure that the scientific aspects are adhered too in the North Central Coast zone. The rockfish areas are hard/rocky bottom and the percentage vs. Soft/sand bottom is low. As a hook and line fisherman and being subject to the current regulations and as a conservationist I believe in only taking what I will eat. The people that will be affected are either working at it as a living or as consumptive users believe in the same.

Please accept Proposal 2 - XA and forward it to the Fish and Game commision.

Thank You,

James Volberding

Fisherman and Coastside Fishing Club Member

From: Daniel Helminiak [<mailto:helminiakdan@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, March 18, 2008 5:56 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Final proposal 2-XA

I am a commercial fisherman in the north-central region and fishing primarily from the port of Bodega Bay. This is a good portion of my annual income. I believe proposal 2-XA will benefit everyone in the long run. Considering the proposed Yelloweye rockfish conservation areas north of Point Arena in state waters coupled with the North Coast MPA's I'm afraid will drive fishers south of Point Arena. We will need space! This proposal is fair, takes into consideration all parties and meets the conservation guidelines.

Thanks for reading my post,
Dan Helminiak

From: Nathan Kawaye [<mailto:nkawaye@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, March 18, 2008 5:20 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA Personal comments

I wish to thank you for this opportunity to comment on the proposals before your team. I and my family have lived in the Bay Area for over 60 years and through out that time we have enjoyed the natural resources that our area so abundantly offers. The enjoyment of the outdoors and our ocean environment has meant countless hours of family time, lessons in nature and ethics that have helped us successfully raised three generations of solid citizens.

I am an executive in the technology industry and the simple pleasures of being on the ocean with my family and friends has kept my sanity intact. I strongly endorse option 2x which is before your team as this represents a strong balance between conservation goals of the MLPA and continued access to our oceans resources.

Sincerely,
Nate Kawaye

From: Bill Dutra [<mailto:wdutra@owensfinancial.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, March 18, 2008 5:03 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA

I am a third generation Californian from a family of 12 (yes, the number is 12) children. As you can imagine, money was a bit scarce growing up. What we could afford usually involved trips camping and fishing in California; from the beaches to the mountain lakes and streams. My parents, as well as most of my siblings, still live in California and enjoy outdoor pursuits. You could say that we have our own little family multiplier as it pertains to our expenditures on recreation in this state. There are now 21 grandchildren (surely more will follow) who are being taught their parent's love of fishing, hunting, camping, etc.

We would all respectfully suggest that you STRONGLY consider implementing MLPA proposal 2, 2X, or whatever the most current iteration of proposal two may be. This proposal seems to be the only proposal which acknowledges the socio-economic impacts of the reserves you are establishing. It is the most balanced proposal, and certainly the only proposal which attempts to fairly provide recreational access to folks like my family and future generations.

This process should be implementing the wishes of the people of California, not special interest groups which want to remove us from the water.

Thank you for considering our feedback.

Bill Dutra

Sr. Vice President

Owens Financial Group, Inc.

From: John Zenner, IDEA Consulting Group, Inc. [mailto:johnz@ideaconsultinggroup.com]**Sent:** Tuesday, March 18, 2008 4:05 PM**To:** MLPAComments**Subject:** I support MLPA proposal #2

I have been a lifelong resident of California. I am proud to have learned to fish from my Grandfather at age 4, fished all my life, have taught my 2 children to fish, and look forward to teaching my grandchildren to fish. I feel that the overall goals of the MLPA are admirable, however the "bought and paid for" implementation using private funds to form public policy, is a great disgrace to the State that all of us will live to regret.

I support conservation and limit my take to just what I need, as do most of my fellow sportsfisherman. We are all conservationists. I support MLPA proposal #2 as the most reasonable proposal for the north coast area. This will more than adequately meet the requirements intended by the MLPA initiative, and also provide critical public access to productive fishing grounds.

I am very financially secure and spend over ten thousand dollars a year in the pursuit of my fishing passion. I sincerely hope that California does not proceed down a path that not only results in the loss of those revenues (multiplied by thousands of sportsfisherman), but will also result in many of us leaving the state along with all our tax dollars. Again, I support proposal #2.

Sincerely,
John M. Zenner

From: Jonathan Dunn [mailto:dunndeals@hotmail.com]**Sent:** Thursday, March 20, 2008 12:59 PM**To:** MLPAComments**Subject:** My email yesterday

Dear Sir/Madam,

Yesterday I sent an email urging the panel adopt option 2 in deciding the closures, I was mistaken. I am supporting option 2AX. I feel it is the most balanced option to protect the environment, the economies of coastal towns and the social/family environment.

Thank You,
Jon Dunn

From: Jonathan Dunn [mailto:dunndeals@hotmail.com]**Sent:** Tuesday, March 18, 2008 3:58 PM**To:** MLPAComments**Subject:** MLPA North Central coast

Dears Sir/Madam,

Some of the most memorable moments of my life involve fishing. Starting in the early 50's when my oldest brother started taking me when I was 9 years old. Continuing into adulthood with good friends and then changing into family outings with my children. Now I continue on by teaching my grandchildren that same love of the outdoors and respect for nature by taking them fishing.

I urge you to implement MLPA Proposal 2.

Thank you,
Jonathan Dunn & children & grandchildren
Oakland CA